

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

LEO GUY, individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

V.

CONVERGENT OUTSOURCING, INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C22-1558 MJP

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
CONSOLIDATE**

RYAN TANNER, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

V.

CONVERGENT OUTSOURCING, INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C22-1562 MJP

1 MAGALY GRANADOS, individually,
2 and on behalf of all others similarly
3 situated,

4 Plaintiff,

5 v.

6 CONVERGENT OUTSOURCING,
INC.,

7 Defendant.
8

9 KERRY LAMONS, individually, and on
10 behalf of all others similarly situated,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 CONVERGENT OUTSOURCING,
14 INC.,

15 Defendant.
16

17 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Consolidate. (Dkt. No. 9.)
18

19 Having reviewed the Motion, noted the lack of any opposition, and all supporting materials, the
20 Court GRANTS the Motion and ORDERS that the above-captioned cases be consolidated for all
21 purposes.
22

23 The plaintiffs in four different actions filed against Defendant Convergent Outsourcing,
24 Inc. ask the Court to consolidate all four into a single action.
25

Under Rule 42(a), the Court may consolidate cases that involve common questions of law
or fact. Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). The Court enjoys broad discretion in making this determination.
See Inv'rs Research Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for Cent. Dist. of Cal., 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir.
1989). The Court usually considers several factors in analyzing consolidation, including judicial

CASE NO. C22-1590 MJP

CASE NO. C22-1597 MJP

1 economy, whether consolidation would expedite resolution of the case, whether separate cases
2 may yield inconsistent results, and the potential prejudice to a party opposing. See 9 Charles
3 Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil § 2383 (3rd ed. 2020).

4 Consolidation is appropriate here given that the four actions present common questions of
5 law and fact and there are substantial efficiencies to be gained. All four actions concern the same
6 data breach resulting from a cyber-attack on Convergent. And plaintiffs pursue the same or
7 similar causes of action against Convergent on behalf of overlapping proposed classes.
8 Consolidation for all purposes will further conserve party and judicial resources. Convergent has
9 not voiced any opposition, and the Court is unaware of any inconvenience, delay, confusion, or
10 prejudice that may result from consolidation. As such, the Court GRANTS the Motion and
11 consolidates all four actions.

12 All filings in this consolidated action shall be filed on the docket of the first-filed case
13 (C22-1558) with the following caption:

14
15 LEO GUY, individually, and on behalf
16 of all others similarly situated,
17
18 Plaintiff,

CASE NO. C22-1558 MJP

v.

19 CONVERGENT OUTSOURCING,
INC.,
20
Defendant.

21 The Clerk is directed to file this Order in all four cases and then administratively close
22 the following related cases: (1) C22-1562 MJP; (2) C22-1590 MJP; and (3) C22-1597 MJP.

23 \\
24

1 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.
2
3

4 Dated December 13, 2022.
5
6

7 
8

9
10 Marsha J. Pechman
11 United States Senior District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24